1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (Boston)
3	No. 1:20-cr-10321-WGY
4	
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
6	
7	vs.
8	
9	JOHN BOAMPONG
10	
11	****
12	* * * * * * *
13	For Hearing Before:
L 4	Judge William G. Young
15	Sentencing
16	
L 7	United States District Court
18	District of Massachusetts (Boston.)
L 9	One Courthouse Way Boston, Massachusetts 02210
20	Tuesday, October 26, 2021
21	*****
22	REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR
23	Official Court Reporter United States District Court
24	One Courthouse Way, Room 5200, Boston, MA 02210 bulldog@richromanow.com
25	~ ~

```
A P P E A R A N C E S
 1
 2
 3
    JOHN T. DAWLEY, JR., ESQ.
       United States Attorney's Office
       John Joseph Moakley Federal Courthouse
 4
       1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
 5
       Boston, Massachusetts 02210
       (617) 748-3207
 6
       Email: John.dawley@usdoj.gov
       For the United States of America
 7
 8
    SANDRA M. GANT, ESQ.
       Federal Defenders Office
 9
       51 Sleeper Street, 5th Floor
       Boston, Massachusetts 02210
10
       (617) 223-8061
       Email: Sandra_gant@fd.org
11
       For the Defendant
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
PROCEEDINGS
 1
 2
           (Begins, 12:00 p.m.)
 3
           THE CLERK: Criminal Matter 20-10321, the United
     States of America versus John Boampong.
 4
 5
           THE COURT: Just a word as we begin about the mask
     protocol. Everyone will wear masks in the courtroom.
 6
     As for counsel and Mr. Boampong and myself, you need not
8
     wear your mask while speaking, but of course you're
     welcome to.
 9
10
           And now would counsel identify themselves and who
11
     they represent starting with the government.
12
           MR. DAWLEY: Good afternoon, your Honor, John
     Dawley for the United States.
13
14
           MS. GANT: Good afternoon, your Honor, Sandra Gant
15
     on behalf of John Boampong.
16
           THE COURT: And may I talk to him directly for a
17
     moment?
           MS. GANT: Yes, of course, your Honor.
18
19
           THE COURT: Mr. Boampong, have you read the
20
     presentence report that's been prepared in your case?
21
           THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
           THE COURT: And have you talked it all over with
22
23
     your attorney?
24
           THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor.
25
           THE COURT: And do you believe you understand it?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated.

Nothing has been withheld from the presentence report under the rules of criminal procedure?

PROBATION OFFICER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

This is a sentencing that proceeds under 18 United States Code Section 3553(a). Sentencing in this session of the court -- while in this instance it involves only three steps because Mr. Boampong has pled under a C-plea, rather he has tendered a plea, and, um, let me start by saying the Court accepts that plea agreement. So that limits the flexibility of the Court in imposing sentence. I don't mean that in any critical way, um, the rules provide for it, and, um, after careful consideration I have accepted the binding plea agreement.

I do, since I have the flexibility to impose a sentence of not less than 42 months nor as much as 63 months, consult the available, um, sentencing statistics. I do not sentence from any statistical measure, but I do consent -- I do consult the actual statistics better to decide the weight to be given to the now, um, nonmandatory advisory guidelines. And the United States Sentencing Commission has come up with a,

um, really a very good, um, computer, um, calculation that goes offense by offense and takes into account the criminal history.

If I look at their data, it shows that for the count of interfering with law enforcement officers during a civil disorder, the average sentence was 52 months. That's also the average for assaulting, resisting, or impeding certain officers or employees.

If I look at the database maintained by

Mr. Romanow, I have only sentenced once for similar

offenses, so that's far from an average, and the

sentence there was the average sentence -- well actually

I sentenced twice and the average was 6 months.

Now I must still calculate the sentencing guidelines and I'll proceed to do that. If anyone differs with any of the calculations that the Court makes, I want you to interrupt me and I will, um, see if I can't resolve the issue.

In this case the, um, offense -- the base offense level is 14. A firearm was discharged, so I add 5 levels. And given the conviction under Section 111(b), I add another 2 levels. Here the victims were government officers and employees, I add another 6 levels, that takes us to 27. I do subtract 3 levels for the guilty plea, that takes us down to 24, Criminal

History Category 1, which gives us a range of 51 months to 63 months, a period of supervised release of not less than 1 nor more than 3 years, a fine of not less than \$20,000 nor more than \$200,000. No request has been made for restitution. And there must be a \$300 special assessment.

Mr. Dawley, are the sentencing guidelines accurately calculated?

MR. DAWLEY: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Gant, are they accurately calculated?

MS. GANT: They are accurately calculated, your Honor, and they are also mirroring what's in the parties's agreement.

THE COURT: I understand. Very well. So those are the sentencing guidelines and the Court adopts them, and the Court has adopted the binding plea agreement.

Because there are determinations I must make, we now turn to the meat of the matter and that is I will hear the government, I will hear Ms. Gant, I will hear from Mr. Boampong if he wishes to be heard from. I have read with care all the memoranda and associated materials that have been submitted.

Mr. Dawley, I'll hear you.

MR. DAWLEY: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, the government in this matter is recommending a 63-month period of imprisonment, 3 years of supervised release thereafter, along with the other terms that we've laid out in our sentencing memo, which I do rely on, um, as well as argument, a fine at the low end, as well as forfeiture and a \$300 special assessment.

Your Honor, the government, in coming to this recommendation, reviewed all the materials extensively and what we have come to, your Honor, is a recommendation within the guidelines based largely on the conduct of the defendants that night.

Your Honor, in terms of -- I've read not only, um, the presentence report, but what counsel has filed and I believe somewhere in there the defendant had indicated that this was a low point of his life, one of the worst times of his life. I would submit, your Honor, in terms of the government's recommendation, that the Court take into consideration that that night, June 1st, 2020 at around 3:00 p.m., was one of the worst moments in the lives of over 10 police officers, Boston Police officers, and that this incident, during riots in the wake of George Floyd's death, starting on May 31st in Boston and going late into the night on June 1st, involved looting, violence all over the city, police

officers had rocks thrown at them, bricks thrown at them, M80s and fireworks fired at them, and 53 people were arrested in this rioting time. Mr. Boampong was one of those individuals.

These officers that night, your Honor, were outnumbered, they had to maintain order in a very large area in Boston, and then while they're doing that, or attempting to do that, at 3:00 in the morning, shots rang out and these police officers frankly in that moment didn't know if they were going home that night.

Your Honor, the facts of this case, as the Court has heard, is an incident on June 1st, 2020 at 3:00 p.m., it occurred right near Downtown Boston, the area of Arlington and Boylston Streets, and there was a lot of looting going on in that commercial area.

The defendant was driving a car with several other occupants, he was told to leave the area due to the looters. The occupants of his vehicle, it was him, his girlfriend, a cousin, and a cousin's husband. The occupants of that vehicle began to be verbally combative with the police officers. The police officers eventually got Mr. Boampong to move his car and what he did was he put the car in reverse. When he put the car in reverse, he started to back up into where a number of other police officers who were trying to maintain order

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were standing. They yelled at him -- they shouted to him to try to get his attention, they yelled at him to stop. It was only after a police officer had to bang on the roof of Mr. Boampong's car that they eventually got him to stop before he was going to strike police officers or cars that were behind him. Mr. Boampong then took off, um, leaving that area and drove away.

Your Honor, that -- in essence that night should have been the end of it. It was not. What occurred is that a short time later video surveillance cameras picked out Mr. Boampong's car, um, that he essentially drove around in a circle, had driven around the area where those police officers were, as he went down and around to a side street, Providence Street. That he got out of the car and walked back towards that area of Arlington and Boylston Street where over 10 police officers were still standing, amongst them one in which is a Federal Task Force Officer, Timothy Stanton, and then he took a firearm out of that vehicle, walked in the direction and fired not one, not two, but eleven .9 millimeter rounds in that direction. The police officers had to take cover, all believing that they were being shot at, as was shown on the video surveillance, and Mr. Boampong immediately thereafter got back in his car and drove way.

Your Honor, in terms of the ballistic evidence that was located on that scene, um, as well as in the side of the building, two of those bullets -- nobody was injured, thank God, but in terms of those bullets, two of those bullets entered that apartment building, which is above the commercial stores on Arlington, Boylston and they entered the window of apartments, um, two apartments that were there on that corner. Again luckily those apartments weren't being rented at the time, they were unoccupied. But again in terms of this conduct that I come back to is what the Court has to take into consideration in sentencing Mr. Boampong today.

As I indicated, he drove off, um, Mr. Boampong did, and was stopped after a brief pursuit. On the passenger area on the floor was a semiautomatic Sigsauer .9 millimeter firearm, um, Mr. Boampong's fingerprint was on that firearm. There was also a black trash bag with various items, um, consistent with the looting that occurred in that area, liquor, clothing, and jewelry. And after Mr. Boampong was *Mirandized* he did admit that he committed the shooting and stated that he was upset that the police had broken his windshield.

Your Honor, this conduct -- and again I can't emphasize it enough, it is egregious and it is

abhorrent, and it is a miracle that nobody was hurt or killed that night by Mr. Boampong's direct actions.

Your Honor, in terms of coming to our recommendation of the 63 months, we do feel it is appropriate, we feel it is reasonable and necessary here based on the 3553(a) factors. We have taken in consideration, um, in speaking with the victims on this matter, speaking with a number of Boston Police officers, including Detective Stanton on that matter, we've told them what our recommendation is and, um, in terms of their thoughts on that recommendation, they're not here today but they are supportive of our recommendation.

I will say that in terms of my specific role in the U.S. Attorney's Office doing Project Safe

Neighborhood in Boston, Tim Stanton is a Boston Police officer, has been for a long time, he's also a Task

Force Officer with the Metro Boston Gang Task Force. I had the opportunity to work with him on almost a daily basis as well as several of the other police officers that were involved in this incident. I can say that Detective Stanton is on a totally-unrelated search warrant today, but he has been kept in the loop, as have the other officers through myself and through AUSA Garland and through the FBI, and they fully endorse the

U.S. Attorney's Office's recommendation at this time given the circumstances here.

Your Honor, again in terms of the government's, um, recommendation, I think it's, um, taken into consideration the nature of the offense here as well as general and specific deterrence, and Mr. Boampong's characteristics, which I'll get to in a minute. But in terms of nature of the offense here, um, what you just heard was a set of facts that is extremely, extremely dangerous, and it's not just extremely dangerous to possess a firearm, it's not just extremely dangerous to fire it, to fire it 11 times, but also in the area of where government officials are working. And I just laid out what the circumstances that those government officials were in.

Your Honor, what I can't emphasize enough, and think Mr. Garland put it in our memo very well, is that government officials should be allowed to do their jobs without fear of violence, especially when they're at their most vulnerable times, um, as was the time like this, the night of this rioting in Boston.

Your Honor, going back to the protest, um, I know we've had this pandemic now, we had the protest, and it is kind of hard at times to go back to that night and what a horrible night that was, and what a tumultuous

period of time that was, um, but in terms of the Court's recollection of that time, um, and all of our recollections of that time, I do hope that that does never happen again, but unfortunately we live in a world where it's a very realistic possibility that something like this could happen again.

The purpose of this sentencing today -- um, one of the purposes of the sentencing today, and the government's recommendation for this 63-month period of imprisonment, is not just specific deterrence for Mr. Boampong, but general deterrence to any individual that thinks that they're going to go well beyond their freedom of speech and right to protest and to take matters into their own hands the way Mr. Boampong did that night.

Your Honor, in furtherance and in specific deterrence to Mr. Boampong, I would submit, and we have laid out, um, that this is a reasonable sentence. In terms of the consideration, this was a C-plea to arrange, um, and did also take into consideration that Mr. Boampong was facing the very real possibility of a 924(C) charge, which would be a 10-year minimum mandatory sentence on and after whatever he received for the counts that he has pled guilty on the information here. And, your Honor, I submit that in coming to our

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recommendation -- and laying that out for the Boston

Police officers in terms of the possibilities of what

could happen here today, that has all been taken in

consideration and Mr. Boampong has been given that

benefit in terms of resolving that matter on the charges

he's currently resolving it on.

So with all that being said, Judge, I'll leave it with what is the lowest sentence reasonably necessary? And I know that counsel in her memo has addressed this at length. She has -- counsel has indicated a lot of Mr. Boampong's history, in fact in essence his life story, and I've read through that and I've gone through all of that and his characteristics, but what I say to that, your Honor, is that, um, unfortunately pretty much everyone who's come through this courthouse who has committed crimes has had some hardships in their life, has had to go through good times and bad, and on the other side, your Honor, a lot of people who come before the Court, almost everybody, do have family members, friends, people that support them and love them, and yet most people in our society are able to avoid committing a crime so egregious as to what Mr. Boampong did that night at 3:00 in the morning on June 1st.

I would ask the Court to take into consideration what we have laid out in our memo. Mr. Boampong has

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

talked about -- at length about his background before that night, um, but I just don't get how, um, Mr. Boampong, um, can in any way say that that might be a justification for what was done or that there was a mistake by what he had done. Your Honor, what he did that night was to possess a gun, possess a firearm that he's prohibited and he knows that he's not allowed to possess. He went there that night, um, and had a car -was driving a car with stolen merchandise in it, and he brought that firearm in that car, that was loaded, to a riot. And given all the history he's had with the police, he had that gun loaded with numerous rounds of ammunition. And this, your Honor, wasn't some, um, reaction, this wasn't some mistake, this was a series of deliberate decisions that Mr. Boampong made that night and deliberate decisions that led to a very serious crime.

Your Honor, in terms of the lowest possible recommendation that is reasonably necessary here, the defense has asked -- they will ask for a period of essentially 3 1/2 years. Your Honor, in terms of the government's recommendation here, it is taken into consideration that he fired not once, not twice, but 11 times after this interaction with Boston Police officers, causing these police officers, who had been

out all night dealing with rioting and looting, to fear for their lives, that they were being shot at. Your Honor, in terms of what is reasonably necessary to enforce here before the Court, quite frankly 3 1/2 years is just not simply enough.

Your Honor, the 63 months here takes into consideration all the 3553 factors here and quite frankly, your Honor, it's a miracle that somebody wasn't hurt or killed. It's also a miracle, Judge -- and he had three other occupants in his car, it is equally thankful that the police were able to stop him, but also didn't return fire and didn't kill or injure any of the other individuals involved in this.

So given the totality of the circumstances here, your Honor, I reiterate again, um, this was not a mistake, this is an extremely dangerous crime, um, and this is crime and violence against a federal officer and numerous police officers. I think Judge Kelley indicated in her detention, which is leading our sentencing memo, that the fact that no one was injured or killed that night is simply miraculous. So given the totality of the circumstances here and the seriousness of Mr. Boampong's conduct, we would recommend to the Court the 63 months in prison, 3 years of supervised release thereafter, along with those other terms.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Gant, um, naturally I've read your materials very carefully. The nub -- because I want you to address it, he possesses a firearm. He has no right to be out there with a firearm. And more than that, he shoots it repeatedly. That's the nub here. I'll hear you.

MS. GANT: That is the nub, your Honor, and frankly if that were the only consideration that the Court were to take, then the Court doesn't need to go further than the government's focus on the seriousness of the offense here.

There are two things that the government said that we absolutely agree with, the first is that this was a very serious crime. John Boampong knows that. The second thing the government said is that it's hard for many of us to think back on the night of June 1st, 2020 and remember how chaotic, how upsetting, how devastating it was not just to the City of Boston, but to other cities in which protests were happening. But it was not hard to remember for Mr. Boampong. It is not hard for Mr. Boampong to remember June 1st of 2020 because it was the worst night of his life, it was the worst decision he ever made, and it was the culmination of significant

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

trauma and pain, and frankly the destabilizing experience that he had in the months that preceded it.

He knows he shouldn't have possessed a gun. He knows he shouldn't have fired it. He will tell you that he wishes he had gone home to his son, Jeremiah, and that he replays that night every single day that he's in jail and will continue to do so frankly for the rest of his life because he is ashamed of his conduct, because he is grateful that nobody was hurt. But the problem with the government's sentencing memorandum and its argument today is that it gives less than short-shrift to his personal history, to his trauma, to his lived experiences as a black man in Boston, to his prior traumas with police officers, and to his particular vulnerability in June of 2020, which was just one week after witnessing the life snuffed out of George Floyd by a Minneapolis Police officer and just after the one-year anniversary of the death of his mother, which was an event that impacted him beyond measure. Only one sentence of the government's sentencing memorandum is devoted to discarding these facts and elements that propelled John Boampong to his lowest point on June 1st of 2020. And as an advocate, I've been tasked with telling Mr. Boampong's story and speaking on his behalf, but if there's anything that the last several years have

shown us is that as a white American, as a white woman,

I can never truly understand the depth or extent of his
pain or the black pain in America.

I have --

THE COURT: Should that, um, ameliorate the sentence?

MS. GANT: It should not ameliorate it and it certainly doesn't justify it, and he never attempts to justify it. The government's characterization that he uses his past experiences as a justification or his lived or perceived experiences of racism to explain or justify his actions is inaccurate. A close reading of the defendant's sentencing memorandum says that this is one of the things that the Court must take into account.

And the history of racism is not history for John Boampong and it is not an issue necessarily that I think the Court, um, needs to find as a justification.

Instead his lived and perceived experiences of racism permeated his daily life, it permeated how he walks down the street, how he interacted with police officers, the fear that consumed him when he interacted with police officers, and, um, it informed -- it's impossible to separate his actions from those experiences.

And I want to take a moment just to talk about what happened to him in 2010, because that was a truly

traumatic experience. In the words of those closest to him, it was "absolutely traumatizing." He was hospitalized for 18 days after an encounter with police where he was beaten, he was pepper-sprayed, and his infant son, Jeremiah, was pepper-sprayed, as his partner helped him. After that 18-day hospitalization, John Boampong sank into a deep depression. He was hospitalized for a suicide attempt, he was ultimately, um, underwent therapy and medication for many years, and the importance of that is because that was a stabilizing and solidifying factor that kept him on solid ground for many years.

After the death of his mother in 2019, John Boampong started to destabilize, and that is borne out by the report of Dr. Reid and by the descriptions of those closest to him. Because his actions ultimately on June 1st, 2020 were borne out of very specific and very unusual circumstances that I don't think are ever likely to be repeated. And again we have never used these as a justification. And I really went through extreme measures to impress upon the Court that Mr. Boampong doesn't see any of this as a justification or excuse.

But by May of 2020, John Boampong was frankly rudderless in this perfect storm of events. He lost his mother one year prior, he was wracked with tremendous

guilt over her passing. His relationship with his longtime partner was broken and that ended. He sank into
himself, into a deep depression. When the Covid 19

pandemic hit, he not only lost his job where he was on a
management track, but Cogman Square Health Center closed
and he was unable to engage in the therapy that had kept
him afloat for years. His medications ran out and he
was unable to immediately renew them. And so the John
Boampong that the Court should evaluate is frankly two
people. First, is the John Boampong on the night of
June 1st, 2020, and the second is the John Boampong who
is stable, feeling well, and is frankly a model for the
children of his community.

We have all had time and distance and information to process George Floyd's death, but John didn't have that on June 1st. So when the Court asked, "Is race an issue that should ameliorate his offense?" I wouldn't say that it is, I wouldn't say that it is something that ameliorates his offense, but it absolutely is a factor in his life that is unavoidable. Because if the Court cannot see color, if the government cannot see color, then they can't see John Boampong.

Ultimately in this case, Dr. Reid I think said it best, he said in the settings of these losses and his psychological deterioration, when John was drinking

heavily in leading up to this offense, he was more vulnerable to behaving more impulsively and thoughtlessly.

THE COURT: But you see those things about

Mr. Boampong, and all sentencings necessarily is

individual, and so it is this Court's obligation to see

him, and when you say if we don't take these things into

account, we don't see him, well you're right in the

sense that it's my absolute obligation to see him, this

man. But you must acknowledge, that's not my only

obligation, my obligation is to see the needs of

society, on that night, in those circumstances, in the

legal framework that we have, which was on the verge of

breaking down, with officers who are out there doing

their job.

So, um, you're of course right, but I'm groping for how do I take that into account against firing off 11 rounds on a night of rioting and looting?

MS. GANT: I think the question isn't to explain or justify his offense, but to understand why it happened and how he got to that point.

THE COURT: Well suppose -- and you're doing it very well. But then I must ask myself "And so" --

MS. GANT: "And so," and I can get there, your Honor.

THE COURT: "And so?"

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GANT: "And so," because this was a very particular and unique set of circumstances that propels him to that night, the Court has an outline in Dr. Reid's report that essentially explains what are the factors that are necessary to keep John Boampong stable, safe, and to keep the community safe? And ultimately she says that because that night, where he was particularly vulnerable to irresponsible and dangerous decisions based on everything, the perfect storm that came before, that if we identify specific resources and treatment avenues, that John Boampong will be stable. And she specifically makes recommendations for treatments that involve individual psychotherapy, a medication regimen -- which he was not adhering to at the time due to the cessation of services during the pandemic, substance abuse treatment, which he was not engaged in before and in which he himself admitted that he had been using as a coping mechanism since his mother's death, and ultimately that this may be a perfect case for something like Restorative Justice, because John Boampong is not anti-police.

THE COURT: Understand we have a binding plea agreement, he's going to prison for at least 32 months.

MS. GANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. GANT: I think -- the reason I raise the issue of Restorative Justice is -- I had meant to include it in the memorandum, um, because I think this may actually be a fairly perfect case for it when he's released as part of his supervised release terms.

The officers who encountered John Boampong that night didn't know him, they didn't know his history, they didn't know what his particular issues were, and what his history was. But he also didn't know them and he didn't know necessarily the impact that his actions would have had, and that is a problem.

THE COURT: But that's an aspect of life in an urban area, that's one reason that police officers wear uniforms, they're not known. And I understand the concept of neighborhood policing and the like, but in circumstances such as this they're not known to the people on the street, but they have every right to be obeyed such that the peace of the community may be maintained.

MS. GANT: And we don't disagree with you, by any means we don't disagree with you. The night that was described by the government was one of absolute chaos.

John Boampong was not involved himself in looting, he picked up passengers who were suspected to have engaged

in the receipt of some property, but that not John. His huge error, first, was having a gun in that car, and the second was turning around and firing it. He knows that. The sentence that the Court imposes is not going to communicate to John Boampong that that was wrong, he is frankly a man of God, he has sat with this for more than 17 months and essentially flagellated himself, come to beg the mercy of his God to be able to make it through to the next day.

THE COURT: What is my duty in these circumstances to the principle of general deterrence?

MS. GANT: So I think because -- first I think this is a particularly unique set of circumstances so I don't think general deterrence should be weighed as equally as the other factors. So that's one issue.

The second is, if we look at, um -- it's hard at this point, I think, to gauge these sentences that have been or will be netted out in similar offenses that occurred at that time because it was a very particular moment in time, a very unique moment in time in the aftermath of George Floyd's death, kind of akin, I think, to, you know, the televised war of Vietnam when it ultimately flooded people's living rooms and people were greatly affected by that. The same thing happened with George Floyd when his death was witnessed over and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

over and over on people's devices, computers, and TV sets. And because this was a particularly unique moment in time, I don't think that general deterrence should be afforded the same weight as a sentencing consideration.

Second, I think that, um, that some of the examples that I have given at the end of the sentencing memorandum reflect instances where the actions were intended, premeditated, and designed to destabilize a vulnerable city, these kinds of false-flag operations that were deployed in Minneapolis. Many of the individuals who participated in protests, whether it be in Portland Oregon, Minneapolis, or Boston, have not yet been sentenced, so I don't have appropriate comps to be able to afford the Court in its consideration in terms of sentencing disparity. But if we think about it in terms of deterrence, 42 months for somebody who's never been in jail is a very long time. The government says it's just not enough. But that only considers the circumstances of the offense, not the "why," not the "how," not ultimately how do you prevent this from ever happening again?

I think this Court can send a message to not only the City of Boston, but to the black community in Boston that a man like John Boampong is worthy of redemption -- certainly punishment, and he recognizes that he deserves

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that, but that he's worthy of redemption, and he's worthy of this Court's investment. And I think by imposing a sentence of 42 months, which John will measure by the number of days that he's away from his son, by the number of dinners he will miss with his child, by the amount of time he will miss with his family, that that is a significant sentence that, despite the government saying it's not enough, is certainly very long.

I won't belabor the issues in the sentencing memorandum but I do want to alert the Court that Mr. Boampong does have supporters in the court today, he has his sister, Nakia, his Godfather, Edward Gathers, and his Godbrother, Jamal Gathers. These are individuals who have described how much of an aberration his conduct was for Mr. Boampong and frankly how upset they were. There is accountability here both in the small scheme and in the large scheme, and I think the factors that the Court has to consider in my mind has to begin and end with John Boampong. Keeping the community safe from a John Boampong that is stable, committed to the ideals that his Godfather and his mother instilled in him, I don't think the Court needs to be worried about that John Boampong, and that's the John Boampong who stands before you today.

I do know that he wants to address the Court. And I do want to just say that the 42 months that we requested takes into account the fact that day for day this sentence is going to be longer and harder for him.

In January 22, 2022, the Bureau of Prisons is set to implement earned-time credits under the First Step Act, which will make available evidence-based recidivism reduction programming to a number of inmates as well as a series of productive activities. Those inmates who are eligible to receive earned-time credits under the BOP's -- under the First Step Act, are going to be prioritized for the very programming that John Boampong would benefit from.

So the sentence that he's going to be serving is going to be functionally, visually, and day to day very different, and frankly more difficult.

THE COURT: You lost me there. I understood you to be saying that this was an advance in penology.

MS. GANT: It is an advance for the BOP at large, but his particular offense, specifically a 111(b) offense, disqualifies him from earning time credits and it disqualifies him ultimately from priority consideration for the programming for which he would benefit.

THE COURT: Oh, I see, by the statute.

MS. GANT: By the statute, by function of the First Step Act and the BOP's deployment of that starting in January.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MS. GANT: So the specific evidence -- I made a list of programs in the, um, in the defendant's sentencing memorandum that are specifically evidenced-based recidivism reduction programs that were studied by the BOP, signed off by partner agencies, and known to, um, significantly reduce recidivism, and John Boampong wants to participate in those kinds of programs and he would benefit from participating in this program, he's an industrious and incredibly diligent man.

For the last -- since he's been at Wyatt, I think since September or October of last year, he's been employed as a unit worker, it's something that he dedicates himself to very seriously. It's a modest job, I mean I think it's maybe \$1.35 a week or something like that, but it is something that he takes seriously because he sees himself as giving back to the unit where he's living. And so he may be able to, in those 42 months in the BOP, do some kind of work, but he's going to be exempt from all of the various programs from which he would benefit, including vocational programs like the Federal Prison Industry's program, um, and like the

specific vocational training that's outlined in the evidence-based recidivism reduction program that's listed in the defendant's sentencing memorandum.

So the government says that 42 months is not enough, but functionally it is more than enough to deter John Boampong, to send a message to the community that this conduct is serious, but that he is worthy of this Court's investment and worthy of the opportunity to redeem himself in the eyes of this Court, his family, and frankly his country.

Now I'm going to defer to Mr. Boampong because I do know he wishes to address the Court.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Boampong, that is your right, you have the right to speak to me directly. Remember you don't have to, but if you want to, I'll hear you now.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I would like to.

THE COURT: Proceed.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you for letting me express myself, your Honor. It's very important for me to speak to you today to own my actions and to show you how far I am from a violent person.

It's been 28 years of my life without a criminal record. After my first case with the police in 2010, I was traumatized, I struggled with depression and

nightmares. There were times that I thought my son would be better off without me so I checked myself into a mental health facility to seek help for all that I was going through because I couldn't endure any more on my own. I also joined a group called "Fathers Uplift," at the advice of my therapist, to engage in group therapy along with my individual therapy. I did that for many years.

After my mom passed away in 2009 -- excuse me, in 2019, May, I took it very very hard, I did not or could not understand that the one person who was so dear to me could have died so suddenly or the way that she died, due to medical neglect. I visited her every day, I washed her clothes, I tucked her into bed at times, and I asked staff to check on her not knowing it would be the last time that I would have any type of interaction with my mother.

I later learned that a half an hour after I had left her bedside, she had passed away. I was so heartbroken that I wanted to crawl up in a ball and die myself, because I failed her. The only thing that kept me grounded was my son. I cherish my son as he is one of my greatest accomplishments in life. I really cherish him. He is smart, he is kind, and I am a very involved father in his life.

The other thing that gave me purpose after my mom died was my job at Boston Sports Club as a customer service manager, it gave me direction and a sense of responsibility, as I've had many employees that reported to me and asked me for advice on a lot of things. I also took a management course at Boston Sports Club to try to become a more successful manager.

On June 1st, 2020, I made the worst decision of my life, I could have hurt people or killed people. I carry that with me every day. I have no one to blame but myself. I blame myself for not being true to everything that my mother and my Godfather had instilled in me. I'm deeply sorry for everyone who has been impacted and affected by my decisions and actions.

I lost my job that I could have turned further advancement into a great career. I let my son down. I let down my family, friends, as well as my community. A lot of people looked up to me for sound judgment, advice, and how to maneuver through adversity in troubled times. I was a great role model for the children in my life. For those who say "It takes a village to raise a child," I'm that villager, when called upon, at all times, no matter what it calls for. And I'm determined to live up to all of that again.

If I could have that night over again, I would

have been home with my son, my Godson, my little cousins, we would have been barbecuing, running around the yard, playing, being active, youthful, until I was able to start my career at the Boston Sports Club as a manager.

I miss being there for my son and all the children in my life, I miss talking to them about what's going on in their lives and helping them with any issues they may have. I miss my son a lot. Since his birth we have never been separated for an extended period of time and it hurts me to have let him down. It hurts me to hear him say that he thinks I don't love him because I left him all alone. And I miss my Godson as well, he is only 4 years old and he's always asking when will he see me again, not to mention the numerous amount of nieces and nephews who I speak to on a frequent basis that ask the same thing.

The impact of jail has been really hard for me too and I want you to know that I understand the consequences of my actions. I hate jail with every fiber of my being. I feel ashamed to be here and to be viewed as a low-life criminal. It hurts my soul. And it's also been really scary during Covid as I have contact with people who have Covid and have contracted Covid myself.

I've watched people get really sick and be rushed to the hospital from jail. I've seen people harm themself. One inmate took a swan dive off his top bunk, almost breaking his neck. Another inmate hung himself. I stood in disbelief as they're pulled into their cells and medical staff tried everything they could to try to bring them back.

This place is full of pain, despair, and death. I never want to do anything to put myself here again. I want to live up to the ideals that my mother and Godfather instilled in me. I want to continue to be a great father to my son. I'm asking for the opportunity to redeem myself, my life, my character, and to honor my family, my community, and this Court.

Thank you, your Honor, for allowing me to speak. (Pause.)

THE COURT: Mr. John Boampong, in consideration of the offenses of which you stand convicted, the principles of 18 United States Code, Section 3553(a), the information from the United States Attorney, your attorney, the probation officer, and yourself, this Court sentences you to 5 years -- 60 months on each of the counts of conviction, the sentence on each count to run concurrent, one with the other. Thereafter the Court places you on 3 years of supervised release with

all the general and special conditions of supervised release set forth in the presentence report.

The Court imposes no fine due to your inability to pay a fine. The Court imposes the \$300 special assessment as required by the law.

You shall have credit toward the service of that sentence from the 1st of June, 2020 until today, because you've been in custody for that time. Let me explain this sentence to you.

Mr. Boampong, I do see you, I see you, the person. I try always to be candid when I sentence. And in one respect, despite the excellent argument made on your behalf by your attorney, I disagree with her. This is a time where the principle of general deterrence weighs very heavily in the balance. Circumstances of that night, the risk of breakdown of our legal framework, and the violent actions that you took, possessing and firing a firearm 11 times, transporting people who, I am left to believe, if they were not themselves looting, were the recipients of materials that had been looted, requires a severe sentence.

Now having said that -- and I have no hesitancy in saying it, none -- whether you believe me or not, I believe everything you just said on your behalf. I believe you are a person of deep faith, of genuine

remorse. I see many offenders who say "I'm sorry" after it's over. In your case, from the time you pled guilty, I was convinced that you appreciated the severity of your actions. You did not try to excuse them. You accepted them. You said, and I recall it vividly, that you were setting an example for your son by your conduct after you were arrested. And so you have.

It is the strong recommendation of this Court, and it will be in the judgment and commitment order, that the rehabilitative services of the institution where you serve your sentence be made available to you, because it is this Court's view that you are a person who can take best advantage of them. I do recognize that. But this is a just and a fair sentence. It is a sentence that all of us as a society require.

You have the right to appeal from this sentence. Should you appeal and should your appeal be successful in whole or in part and the case remanded, you'll be resentenced by another judge. Ms. Gant, if an appeal is decided upon, you want transcript, seek it from this session of the court because I'll turn it around right away.

Do you understand?

MS. GANT: Of course, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: That's the sentence of the Court, he's

remanded to the custody of the marshals. 1 PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor? 2 3 THE COURT: Yes. PROBATION OFFICER: I may have missed it, but I 4 5 would recommend, um, for supervised release that all of the standard conditions be imposed and that the special 6 condition be imposed that he participate in mental 8 health treatment and take his medications as directed 9 and contribute according to his ability to do so. 10 THE COURT: It is so ordered in precisely the 11 language that you suggested. And if I overlooked it, I 12 apologize. 13 Thank you, your Honor. PROBATION OFFICER: 14 THE COURT: And I should say something further, 15 picking up on Ms. Gant's very, um, thorough argument. 16 It does seem to me that when he goes on supervised 17 release, he ought be considered for our Restorative 18 Justice Program. 19 PROBATION OFFICER: I will list that as a judicial 20 obligation. 21 THE COURT: Yes. Ms. Gant? 22 23 MS. GANT: Thank you, your Honor. I neglected to 24 ask, um, consistent with the First Step Act's 25 considerations of proximity to a home in terms of BOP

```
placement, that the Court recommend, commensurate with
1
 2
     Mr. Boampong's security level, that he be placed in a
 3
     facility close to home.
           THE COURT: I will so recommend and the judgment
 4
 5
     will reflect it.
 6
           MS. GANT: Thank you, your Honor.
 7
           THE COURT: That's the sentence of the Court.
8
           MR. DAWLEY: Your Honor, I apologize, I have one
     more point. I might have missed it as well. But I
9
10
     would just point out, um, for the Court and for the
11
     defendant, that there was a notification already that
12
     there is a forfeiture of the firearm --
13
           THE COURT: The forfeiture is allowed as to the
14
     firearm.
15
           MR. DAWLEY: Thank you, your Honor.
16
           THE COURT: Thank you both. We'll recess.
17
           (Ends, 1:00 p.m.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes, before Judge William G. Young, on Tuesday, October 26, 2021, to the best of my skill and ability. /s/ Richard H. Romanow 11/01/21 RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date